# **Student Growth Workgroup**

**Educator Effectiveness Project** 

#### **MINUTES**

March 8, 2012: Meeting #8

Utah Law and Justice Center

Present: Lynne Baty, Jay Blain, Jen Lambert, David Smith, Leah Voorhies, Aaron Brough, Robert Cox, JoEllen Shaeffer, Emily Tew, Lori Gardner, Cathy Jensen, Sara Jones, Kerrie Naylor, Selena Terry, Darryl Thomas, Logan Toone, Paul Wagner, Reed Spencer, Wendy Carver, John Jesse, John Jess.

Excused: Linda Alder, James Birch, Laurel Brown, Sydnee Dickson, Brian McGill, Travis Rawlings Judy Park, Kevin King.

1. Welcome Kerrie (9:00)

- Roll, travel vouchers, etc.
- Review and approve Minutes for Meeting #7 February 7, 2012
- Review Agenda
- Goals for today
  - o Discuss the draft plan for Utah's Student Learning Objective process
  - Continue discussions of tested subjects and grades and shared attribution
  - Review a tentative timeline for Implementation of the content area SLOs

The Minutes from Meeting #7 February 7 were reviewed. Minutes were moved and seconded by Jennifer Lambert and JoEllen Shaeffer.

Goals for today were reviewed. Kerrie will send meeting reminders closer to the meeting date.

2. Student Learning Objectives (SLO) Proposal

Scott Marion (9:15)

• Discuss SLO draft proposal

The group reviewed a draft of the SLO Guidance DRAFT Document that Scott prepared from the feedback at the February 7<sup>th</sup> Meeting #7. The group discussed this new draft document in detail. Many suggestions and comments were made. Some important points in the discussion are summarized below:

- This document is trying to fit the needs of a variety of districts into the process of creating Student Learning Objectives to document educators' contributions to student performance
- SLO's do not have to be more work or another layer of work they should be what teachers are already doing to establish a method of assessing whether students are progressing and achieving
- SLO's incentivize good practice and are indications of what teachers and leaders already do
- The State Office will need to create, with the help of districts and content specialists, a bank of exemplar SLOs in content areas over time
- Non-content-based SLOs may to included, but they must be in addition to the academic outcomes
- We want to allow the districts flexibility in deciding how teachers of multiple courses or sections will determine a
  representative set of SLOs—it was suggested that we could recommend that it be by proportion and rotate through the
  years
- Whether teachers of tested subjects and grade will also do SLOs was not decided and this concept needs to have further discussion
- The rating scale for the accomplishment of the SLOs needs to determined and then it will be added to the summative scoring matrix to determine final ratings
- Whether an SLO should address growth or status or both will need to be determined
- Developing a template for SLOs will be important to do

- Developing quality assessments to determine learning gains is an issue and the State may need to have a plan for assisting LEAs with this requirement
- Providing explicit instructions for developing SLOs will also be important
- A professional development plan for SEA/LEA will need to be in place to tie support and assurances
- Determining what the pilot will look like still needs to be determined
- What the state review process will look like also needs to be determined
- Criteria to evaluate the quality of the SLOs also needs to be determined
- A suggested list of activities that the LEA must do to get ready for the SLO process needs to be written
- A suggested list of activities that the SEA will do to support the SLO process will be compiled
- An accountability system for developing SLOs district-wide should be recommended to LEAs
- Using the School Improvement Plan goals as a possibility for common SLOs for all teachers in the school was discussed but a recommendation was not made
- A guidance document for educational leaders and SLOs needs to be determined
- Shared attribution is good for students in performance-based courses and special education
- The concept of shared attribution of tested subjects and blending that with non-tested subjects and grades, is still an
  issue that needs to be decided
- Shared attribution needs to be determined
- Teacher specialists and counselors, etc., need to be considered in the SLO process and perhaps matching job descriptions of specialists with regular education is a possibility
- Change the "should" to "shalls" in the document

Scott agreed to take this information and send a second DRAFT to Kerrie that will be sent out prior to the meeting April 17.

#### Break 10:15

3. Discuss Content SLO Assignment

Scott (10:30)

Selena, Wendy, Leah, Paul, David, and Logan presented sample SLOs that they created with content specialists of their choosing. Much discussion took place regarding the specificity, quality, process, difficulty, purpose, strengths and challenges of SLOs. Mostly, the group thought the exercise was worthwhile and helped them see some of the issues associated with SLOs.

4. Review plan for implementation

Kerrie (11:45)

- SLO Timeline and Checklist
- Gradual Implementation Plan

Kerrie presented a very rough DRAFT of a Gradual Timeline for SLO and Student Growth Measures implementation. The group reviewed it and was glad to see something in writing. However, it needs further work. Kerrie and Lynne will work on it.

A Timeline and description of LEA and SEA responsibilities for implementing SLOs also needs to be compiled. Kerrie and Lynne will begin a draft of this as well.

## Lunch Break 12:00

5. Student Growth Percentiles for Tested Subjects and Grades

Scott (12:30)

- How to use the SGP model and what it means for teachers and leaders
- 6. Shared Attribution for both tested and non-tested subjects and grades

Scott (1:45)

Scott presented a PPT on Student Growth Percentiles and the use of SGP related to educator accountability and evaluation. He also reviewed concepts of shared attribution for tested subjects and grades results.

The weighting of these measures and how they relate to the complete evaluation system to produce a summative final rating will need to be part of the discussion April 17, Meeting #9.

### 7. Consensus Building and Closing Comments

Lynne (2:45)

Concerns about the SLO process and why our workgroup was moving in this direction surfaced at the end of the meeting. The bottom line was that the group wants to <u>develop a process and methodology for helping teachers and leaders of non-tested subjects and grades know if their students are learning.</u> Is the SLO process the best way to do this considering Utah does not have the resources to develop banks of assessments tied to content areas' goals and objectives? The group agreed that three major concerns with SLOs are:

- There are so many different ways of writing and creating SLOs that it may be hard to determine comparability state-wide
- 2. Quality control criteria is absolutely necessary if we are to have any comparable data and meet the expectations of the legislators
- 3. Professional development planning is critical and the state's involvement in this must be mandatory If these concerns can be addressed, the majority of the group believes that SLOs hold promise.

Paul volunteered to come to the meeting next time to present for 20 minutes on how he would like to see the process work. This will be on the agenda at the next meeting.

8. Adjourn 3:00

- 9. Future Meetings:
  - April 17: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center: Finish up recommendations for weightings of Student Learning Measures
  - April 24: Education Evaluation Summit, U of U Marriott, 8:00 3:00 p.m.
  - May 8: 9-3:00, Utah Law and Justice Center: Begin work on technical criteria for quality SLOs

Lunch will be provided at noon. Thank you for your participation. Minutes will be sent electronically.